1	LAW OFFICES OF WEBER & NIERENBERG		
2	JOSEPH S. NIERENBERG (SBN 111893) Email: wnnlaw@aol.com		
3	1999 Harrison Street, Suite 600, Oakland, CA 94612-3586 Telephone: 510.663.6000; Facsimile: 510.663.6006		
4	Attorney for Plaintiff CHRISTOPHER DANIEL KNOWLES		
5	LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP		
6	Email: Shawn. Toliver@LewisBrisbois.com		
7	Email: Charlene Rosack@LewisBrishois com		
8	COLIN E. HOWARD (SBN 202587)		
9	333 Bush Street, Suite 1100, San Francisco, CA 94104-2872		
10	Attorney for Defendant EDWIN HONORIO MORALES-CORTES		
11			
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
14	CHRISTOPHER DANIEL KNOWLES,	CASE NO. 3:16-cv-05356-JSC	
15	Plaintiff,	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT	
16	VS.	STATEMENT & [PROPOSED] ORDER	
17	EDWIN HONORIO CORTES, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,		
18	Defendants.		
19	Defendants.		
20	The parties to the above-entitled action jointly submit this JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT		
21	STATEMENT & PROPOSED ORDER pursuant to the Standing Order for All Judges of the Northern		
22	District of California dated July 1, 2011 and Civil Local Rule 16-9:		
23	1. <u>Jurisdiction and Service:</u>		
24	This is a personal injury case arising from a vehicle vs. vehicle collision that occurred on July		
25	27, 2015 in San Francisco, California. Jurisdiction arises from diversity of citizenship: Defendant		
26	EDWIN HONORIO CORTES is domiciled in Puerto Rico. Plaintiff is domiciled in California.		
27	Defendant CORTES has been served and has filed an Answer.		
28	///		
		1 3:16-cv-05356-JSC	
	JOINT CASE MANAGEME	ENT STATEMENT & [PROPOSED] ORDER	

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18

19

20

21

2223

24

2425

26

2728

2. Facts:

This suit is brought by CHRISTOPHER DANIEL KNOWLES, who is seeking recovery for injuries and damages. On July 27, 2015, plaintiff was operating his motorcycle westbound on Market Street at or near its intersection with Douglass Street in San Francisco, California, when defendant EDWIN HONORIO CORTES was operating a certain 2014 Hyundai automobile. The vehicles collided in the intersection. Liability and the cause of the collision is in dispute.

Plaintiff was in good health before this accident causing an intra-articular fracture of the tibial plateau and a horizontal tear of the posterior horn of the medial meniscus of his right knee, as well as injuries to his head, right arm, right foot and back. He also suffered road rash. His activities have and will continue to be altered because of ongoing accident-related pain.

3. <u>Legal Issues:</u>

- The principal liability and damages issues, which are governed by California tort law, include:
- Whether defendant was negligent.
- If so, whether plaintiff was comparatively negligent.
- If both were negligent, the percentage of their respective fault.
- The amount of reasonable and necessary special damages attributable to the accident.
- The amount of reasonable general damages attributable to the accident.
- The nature and extent of Plaintiff's recoverable damages.

4. Motions:

The parties anticipate filing motions in limine.

5. Amendment of Pleadings:

Defendant filed an amended answer. The parties do not anticipate any further amendment of the pleadings.

Evidence Preservation:

The parties have reviewed the Guidelines Relating to the Discovery of Electronically Stored Information. The parties confirm that they have met and conferred pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) regarding reasonable and proportionate steps to take to preserve evidence relevant to the issues reasonably evident in this action.

1

3

4

7. <u>Disclosures:</u>

2 The p

8. <u>Discovery:</u>

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

1617

18

19

2021

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

The parties will make their initial disclosures on or before the December 15, 2016 deadline.

Plaintiff and defendant will serve interrogatories, document requests and requests for admissions. If liability is not admitted, plaintiff will depose defendant, the investigating officer and the passenger in defendant's vehicle. Defendant will depose Plaintiff, and anticipates the need to obtain an Independent Medical Examination of Plaintiff.

Defendant has subpoenaed plaintiff's medical and employment records.

The parties do not anticipate the need for an e-discovery order in this matter.

9. Class Actions:

This is not a class action.

10. Related Cases:

None.

11. Relief:

Plaintiff seeks the following monetary relief:

Medical Expenses:

\$66,846.84

Wage-Loss:

\$20,000.00 approx.

General Damages: \$500,000.00

Defendant seeks no damages in this action, other than dismissal and costs.

12. Settlement and ADR:

The parties have agreed to complete private mediation with Michael Ney, Esquire no later than May 15, 2017. The parties anticipate that completion of the following discovery will be necessary prior to mediation: written discovery, the deposition of Plaintiff and Defendant, and perhaps an independent medical examination. The parties do not anticipate that any motions will be necessary before mediation.

13. Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes:

Both parties have filed a consent to proceed before a Magistrate Judge for all purposes.

111

14. 1 Other References: 2 None. 3 15. **Narrowing of Issues:** 4 The parties will attempt to narrow the issues through appropriate factual stipulations and 5 motions in limine. 16. 6 **Expedited Scheduling:** 7 The parties do not agree that this case is appropriate for expedited trial procedures. 17. 8 Scheduling: 9 The parties propose the following schedule: Parties seek leave to add new parties or amend the pleadings: Jan. 30, 2017 10 ADR Completion Date: May 15, 2017 11 12 Non-expert discovery completion date: March 30, 2017 13 Expert disclosures: June 1, 2017 14 Rebuttal expert disclosures: June 25, 2017 15 Expert Discovery Cutoff: July 27, 2017 Motions Hearing Deadline: Sep. 20, 2017 16 17 Meet and confer re pretrial filings: Nov. 1, 2017 18 Pretrial filings due: Nov. 9, 2017 19 Oppositions, Objections, Exhibits, and Depo Designations due: Nov. 7, 2017 20 Final Pretrial Conference: Dec. 8, 2017 21 Trial: Jan. 22, 2018 22 18. Trial: 23 Plaintiff and defendant request a jury trial. The parties estimate that the length of trial will be 24 4 -- 6 days. Joseph S. Nierenberg will serve as lead trial attorney for plaintiff. Shawn Toliver will 25 serve as lead trial attorney for defendant. 26 19. Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons: 27 Both parties have filed their Certifications of Interested Entities or Persons. Pursuant to Local 28 Rule 3-15, both parties certify that as of this date, there is no interest to report.

1	20. Professional Conduct:	
2	Both parties have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional Conduct for the Northern District	
3	of California.	
4	21. Other:	
5	None.	
6		
7	DATED: December 15, 2016 LAW OFFICES OF WEBER & NIERENBERG	
8		
9	By: /s/ Joseph S. Nierenberg	
10	Joseph S. Nierenberg Attorneys for Plaintiff	
11	CHRISTOPHER DANIEL KNOWLES	
12	DATED: December 15, 2016 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP	
13		
14	By: _/s/ Colin E. Howard	
15	Shawn A. Toliver Charlene P. Rosack	
16	Colin E. Howard Attorneys for Defendant EDWIN HONORIO MORALES-CORTES	
17	EDWIN HONORIO MORALES-CORTES	
18	CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER	
19	The above JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT & PROPOSED ORDER is	
20	approved as the Case Management Order for this case and all parties shall comply with its provisions.	
21	[In addition, the Court makes the further orders stated below:]	
22		
23		
24		
25	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
26	DATED:	
27	UNITED STATES DISTRICT/MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
28		
	5 3:16-cv-05356-JSC	
- 1	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT & [PROPOSED] ORDER	